How the Washington Post saved the House Assassinations committee HW 3/30/77

George Lardner phoned me yesterday to check out the report ofnthe House assassinations committee. We were on the phone about 4 hours, two sieges on the phone.

I had not seen the rpport. George read passages of his slection. In each and every case none of it was new. Quite apart from this is whether any of it was real.

With one except from the description of the committee I was able to pinpoint the hidden sources, supposedly hidden because of the need for secrecy. The one, an allegation of an Oswald Ruby connection, involved too many possible spurious candidates. I named several but did not specify any one.

The only thingn not ~~xxxxx~~ oresented as totally the committee's great and original work is a reference to Lifton and Cohen as inde]endent when they worked together. Their names are not mentioned. The publication is not. Passing and incomprehensible referecne only. One would ~~xxxx~~ father that the 1/27/64 transcript was unknown to now.

The kind of error added to overt thievery is typified by their having ~~XXXXXX~~ An FBI agent, Frazier, testifying at the evidentiary hewaring. He did not

The totaloty of destruction of the report and the committee'd ramining credibility seemed to impress George. There are few reoorts in the long and painful histroy of the House.

~~[illegible]~~

It seems that George's story was a bit long and that the economy and other Editors do not edit.

Larry Stern is back on National. He did not use the story - and of it. He told Geprge it was a very good piece but because it is a bit long they'd not use any.

The appearance of that story today could have turned the vote in favor of the committee completely around.

It was legitimately a news story, legitimzte commentary, the legitimate subject of an insight piece, etc. Therefore, thereis no mention of it or its contents.

This in turn meant that the Congress was denied information essentail to both the Congress and the press. Hastly